

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
SAN JOSE DIVISION

Steven Nakash, et al.,

NO. C 08-04312 JW

NO. C 08-04332 JF

NO. C 08-04596 RS

Inicom Networks, Inc.,

NO. C 08-05082 HRL

NO. C 08-05179 HRL

Todd Feinstein,

NO. C 08-05217 PVT

NO. C 08-05520 JF

Jordan Cormier,

**ORDER GRANTING MOTIONS TO  
RELATE CASES; SETTING CASE  
MANAGEMENT CONFERENCE**

National Business Officers Association, Inc.,

Brent West,

Louis Olivos,

Plaintiffs,

v.

NVIDIA Corp.,

Defendant.

Presently before the Court are Defendant's administrative motions to relate Nakash v. NVIDIA Corp., No. C 08-4312<sup>1</sup> to the following later-filed cases: (1) Inicom Networks, Inc. v.

<sup>1</sup> Nakash was previously related to Feinstein v. NVIDIA Corp., No. C 08-04596. (See December 3, 2008 Order, hereafter, "December 3 Order," Docket Item No. 21.) In addition, Defendant moves to relate Sielick v. NVIDIA Corp., No. C 08-0802 SS (W.D. Texas). (See Docket Item No. 27.) The Court DENIES this motion as premature since the case has not yet been transferred to this district.

1 NVIDIA Corp., No. C 08-04332 JF<sup>2</sup>; (2) Cormier v. NVIDIA Corp., No. C 08-05082 HRL<sup>3</sup>; (3)  
 2 Nat'l Bus. Officers Assoc., Inc. v. NVIDIA Corp., No C 08-05179 HRL<sup>4</sup>; (4) West v. NVIDIA  
 3 Corp., No. C 08-05217 PVT<sup>5</sup>; (5) Olivos v. NVIDIA Corp., et al., C 08-05520 JF.<sup>6</sup>

4 On December 3, 2008, the Court granted Defendant's motion to relate Nakash and Feinstein.  
 5 (December 3 Order at 2.) The Court also denied, without prejudice to be renewed, Defendant's  
 6 motions to relate Nat'l Bus. Officers, Inicom and Cormier, and to consolidate Nakash and Feinstein  
 7 with Inicom and transfer the consolidated action to Judge Fogel. (Id.) Defendant has now renewed  
 8 its motions and Plaintiffs have joined in these motions.<sup>7</sup>

9 Civil Local Rule 3-12(a) provides that an action is related to another when:

- 10 (1) The actions concern substantially the same parties, property, transaction or event; and  
 11 (2) It appears that there will be an unduly burdensome duplication of labor and expense  
 12 or conflicting results if the cases are conducted before different judges.

13 Upon review, the Court finds that Defendant has made a sufficient showing to establish that each of  
 14 the later-filed cases are substantially related under Local Rule 3-12(a). Since Nakash is the first-  
 15 filed action, the cases are properly related to the Nakash action. Accordingly, the Court GRANTS  
 16 Defendant's various Motions to Relate.

17 Currently, Nakash and Feinstein are scheduled for a Case Management Conference on  
 18 January 26, 2009. In light of this Order, the Court VACATES the January 26, 2009 Case  
 19 Management Conference and sets a Case Management Conference on **February 23, 2009 at 10**

---

21 <sup>2</sup> (See Docket Item No. 26.)

22 <sup>3</sup> (See Docket Item No. 25.)

23 <sup>4</sup> (See Docket Item No. 24.)

24 <sup>5</sup> (See Docket Item No. 23.)

25 <sup>6</sup> (See Docket item No. 31.)


26 <sup>7</sup> (See Docket Item No. 34.) The Court DENIES Plaintiffs' Motion to Consolidate and  
 27 Appoint Lead Plaintiff and Lead Counsel as premature.

1 **a.m.** for all the related cases.<sup>8</sup> On or before **February 13, 2009**, the parties in all of the related  
2 actions shall file a single Joint Case Management. The Statement shall, among other things, set  
3 forth a schedule to advance this case, including a proposed schedule for consolidating the cases into  
4 one action and for the appointment of Lead Plaintiffs and Lead Counsel.

5 Until the actions are consolidated and further order of the Court, all documents shall be filed  
6 in each individual action.

7 In light of this Order, the March 2, 2009 hearing on these motions are VACATED.

8  
9 Dated: December 30, 2008

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
JAMES WARE  
United States District Judge

United States District Court  
For the Northern District of California

10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27 <sup>8</sup> In light of this Order, Plaintiff Nakash and Defendant NVIDIA's Joint Administrative  
28 Motion to Continue Case Management Conference is DENIED as moot. (See Docket Item No. 40.)

1 **THIS IS TO CERTIFY THAT COPIES OF THIS ORDER HAVE BEEN DELIVERED TO:**

2 Joshua Daniel Watts jwatts@orrick.com  
3 Justin Myer Lichterman jlichterman@orrick.com  
4 Paul R. Kiesel Kiesel@kbla.com  
Robert P. Varian rvarian@orrick.com

5 **Dated: December 30, 2008**

**Richard W. Wieking, Clerk**

6  
7 **By: /s/ JW Chambers**  
8 **Elizabeth Garcia**  
9 **Courtroom Deputy**  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28